

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 are now pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Claim 11 has been canceled. Independent claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 has been objected to by the Examiner “because it recites the exact features of claim 5”. In view of the cancellation of claim 11, this objection is moot.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by WO 01/27389 (“*Kaarakka*”). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein said pairs of rolls are stairwise offset staggered on a single frame so as to locate the rolls at different height levels”. No new matter has been added. *Kaarakka* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest this limitation.

The Examiner (pg. 2-3 of the Office Action) asserts that:

Kaarakka discloses calandering arrangements comprising at least two nips formed by roll pairs. Figure 4 shows the arrangement given by independent claim 1.... ***The roll pairs are stairwise offset at different height levels***, with roll pair 11, 12 being higher. ***The arrangement is a staggered V-shaped configuration*** which allows for changing of rolls. See page 8, line 21 to page 12, line 12. (Emphasis Added)

The amended independent claim 1 overcomes the Examiner’s rejection in view of *Kaarakka*.

The claimed invention is directed to, *inter alia*, solving problems related to changing the rolls of a calandar, as well as solving problems disclosed in *Kaarakka*. However, as shown in FIG. 4 of *Kaarakka*, the calandar illustrated therein utilizes two separate frames **21** and **22** such that there is a need for twice as much floor space as the calandar defined by independent claim 1.

Consequently, the two-nip calandar disclosed in *Kaarakka* cannot be used to replace existing, outdated machine calanders without changing the layout of the paper making apparatus considerably, because the calandar of *Kaarakka* cannot fit into the same space as the calandar defined by independent claim 1 (see pg. 2, line 24 thru pg. 3, line 4 of the present specification as originally filed).

On the other hand, however, in the claimed invention, the foregoing spatial problem is solved by the use of a calandar having a single frame, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Typically, changing the rolls in a single frame calandar is a cumbersome task. As a result, single frame soft calendars have typically had little utility. However, the claimed invention overcomes the problem associated with the cumbersomeness of replacing the rolls in a single frame calander by mounting the pairs of rolls in a stairwise staggered manner within a single frame.


*Kaarakka* (pg. 8, lines 22-24; FIG. 4) teaches that “the bearing housings 3-6 of the calender rolls 11-14 are mounted on lightweight frames 21, 22”. *Kaarakka* (pg. 8, lines 31-32; FIG. 4) further teaches that “the calender frames 21, 22 are adapted in a facing disposition...”. *Kaarakka* thus clearly teaches that the calander utilizes separate frames for each roll pair. As a result, there would be no reason for the skilled person to modify the calander of *Kaarakka* into a staggered stepped placement of the rolls in a single frame based on the teachings of *Kaarakka*. Moreover, *Kaarakka* fails to solve the problem associated with providing a calandar having two pairs of rolls that can be placed in a tightly configured room, such as for replacing a machine calendar.

Independent claim 1 is therefore patentable over *Kaarakka* for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is therefore in order, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

In view of the patentability of independent claim 1, for the reason set forth above, dependent claims 2-10 and 12-17 are all patentable.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,  
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By   
Alfred W. Froeblich  
Reg. No. 38,887  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: August 13, 2007